

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Cambalida coriacea* Simon, 1909 (Arachnida, Araneae) by the suppression of *Castianeira fulvipes* Simon, 1896

(Case 3331; see BZN 63: 17–19)

Otto Kraus

*Zoologisches Institut & Zoologisches Museum, Martin-Luther-King-Platz 3,
20146 Hamburg, Germany*

There is no need to conserve the name *Cambalida coriacea* Simon, 1909. Decisive reasons for this view were mentioned in para. 2 of the original application: 'The CORINNIDAE remains one of the most poorly-studied families of spiders . . .'; see also similar remarks in the applicant's para. 4. Since their original introduction and until at least 1995, all names in question were not used again, and afterwards in a very few exceptions: *Castianeira fulvipes* Simon, 1896, *Cambalida coriacea* Simon, 1909 and *Cambalida fulvipes* Simon, 1909. No prevailing usage exists. Hence, stability of practically unused names cannot be threatened. The case should be solved by regular application of the Code. One species should be named *Cambalida fulvipes* (Simon, 1896), with the junior subjective synonym *C. coriacea* Simon, 1909. According to Article 60 of the Code and without any harm, the secondary homonymy in the other species should be solved by replacing *C. fulvipes* Simon, 1909 by a new substitute name.

Comment on the proposed precedence of the specific name of *Buprestis sexsignata* Say, 1839 (Insecta, Coleoptera) over those of *Chrysobothris ignipes* Gory & Laporte, 1838 and *Chrysobothris germari* Gory & Laporte, 1838

(Case 3302; see BZN 63: 36–38)

Richard L. Westcott

*Plant Division, Oregon Department of Agriculture, 635 Capitol NE, Salem,
OR 97301–2532, U.S.A.*

In my opinion there can be no reasonable objection to accepting this proposal. The species is widespread and common in the eastern United States and has been cited many times in the literature. T.C. MacRae provides clear evidence why the Gory & Laporte names should be considered nomina oblita. To resurrect either of them from synonymy, thus making invalid a widely used name, *Chrysobothris sexsignata* (Say), would cause much confusion and work against stability.

Therefore, I urge the acceptance of MacRae's proposal.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Celaenorrhinus ratna* Fruhstorfer, 1908 (Insecta, Lepidoptera)

(Case 3339; see BZN 63(2): 114–117)

Rienk de Jong

*Department of Entomology, Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum Naturalis,
PO Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands*